

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 12, 15-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20 can be found in the specification, for example, at paragraph [0200]. Claims 15-17, 23, 24 and 27-29 are amended for form and clarity. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Woods and Brier at the interview held June 26, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview. Further, claims 1, 11, 12, 15-20 and 27-29 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

I. The Claims Satisfy The Requirements Of 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 15-17, 23, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that a program is claimed and "the order of those elements (computer readable medium and program) must be reversed for the claims to be held as statutory." By this Amendment, independent 15-17 and 28 to recite "A computer readable medium that stores a service providing program for correlating service."

Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, independent claims 15-17 and 28, and claims 23 and 24 depending from claim 16, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-26 Over Glorikian and Giniger

Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,317 to Glorikian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,045 to Giniger et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Glorikian and Giniger, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 11, 12 and 15-20. As agreed during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "service corresponding to the specified space being provided according to the service information stored in the storage device, the service content including restriction of a specific action," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claims 11, 12 and 15-20 (emphasis added).

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 11, 12, 15-20 are patentable over Glorikian and Giniger. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-26, which variously depend from the independent claims, are also patentable over Glorikian and Giniger for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 8 Over Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of Giniger and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,918 to Stewart. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claim 8. Stewart does not remedy the deficiencies of Glorikian and Giniger discussed above with respect to claim independent 1. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Glorikian, Giniger and Stewart for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 27-29 Over Glorkian and Ruffner

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Glorikian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,013 to Ruffner. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Glorikian and Ruffner, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 27-29. As agreed during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "when it is determined according to the object information stored in the storage device that the positional relationship between the mobile input device and the specified space satisfies a predetermined condition, the object-information processing device performing at least one of generation, deletion and update of the at least one of the object information and the service information according to the content of the input performed by the mobile input device," as recited in independent claim 27, and as similarly recited in independent claims 28 and 29 (emphasis added).

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 27-29 are patentable over Glorikian and Ruffner. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: June 29, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--